

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-14 and 16-51 are pending in this application.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 07/15/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues "the mere existence of bugs does not render the claimed invention inoperative and is prima facie evidence that the claimed inventions was not reduced to practice..."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with above argument. As indicated in the previous response, the examiner indicated that the test script contains bugs which do not demonstrate that it work for the intended purpose as require by MPEP 2138.05. Although, the invention does not have to be a commercially satisfactory stage of development to be considered having reduced to practice; however, having bugs in the test script demonstrate the incompleteness of the invention. Therefore, without the invention has been tested for its intended purpose, the actual reduction to practice is not shown. Furthermore, the examiner provided proof such as "bugs" showing in the test scripts as indication of incomplete of the invention. Therefore, The DECLARATION OF SASHIKANTH CHANDRASEKARAN AND ASHOK SAXENA under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Anderson.

***Response to Amendment***

The DECLARATION OF SASHIKANTH CHANDRASEKARAN AND ASHOK SAXENA filed on 06/26/2007 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Anderson.

3. Under MPEP 715.07 Three Ways To Show Prior Invention

In general, proof of actual reduction to practice requires a showing that the apparatus actually existed and work for its intended purpose.

In paragraph 3, the Exhibit E is the output of the test script of Exhibit B-D, there is not indication of any successful of test because the result include bug such as ykunitom\_bu-704908\_1. Therefore, the apparatus is not worked as intended purpose as require in 2138.05 Reduction To Practice states under REQUIERMENT TO ESTABLISH ACTUAL REDUCTION TO PRACTICE, "the same evidence sufficient for a constructive reduction to practice, which requires a showing of the invention in a physical or tangible form that shows every elements of the count. For the actual reduction to practice, the invention must have been sufficiently tested to demonstrate that it will work for its intended purpose.

Therefore, the DECLARATION OF SASHIKANTH CHANDRASEKARAN AND ASHOK SAXENA filed on 06/26/2007 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Anderson reference with following reason.

Art Unit: 2162

The test result in exhibit F provide evidence the apparatus does not work as intended purpose because the test script show bug in the result which indicates the apparatus does not produce expected result. The statement which recited in paragraph 4-44 are general allegation that the invention was complete prior to the date of the reference without a statement of facts demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion, is insufficient to satisfy 37 CFR 1.131.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-14 and 16-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (US. Patent No. 6,442,600 B1) in view of Smith et al. (6,282,564 B1).

Regarding on claims 1 and 54, Anderson teaches a method for managing information to be accessed by multiple consumers, said information comprising one or more information records, said information records to be accessed by said multiple consumers in a specified order, each said information record comprising data to be accessed by a consumer, said method comprising:

Providing said data of an information record to a consumer (the message distribution server (MDS) system receives electronic messages to be distributed to one or more recipients) (col. 3, lines 34-36).

Updating a history table, said history table comprising a history record for each consumer for said information record, said history record comprising a message stage field for indicating whether said data of said information record have been provided to said consumer (the MDS system then tracks and manages requests from the recipient to access the message by permitting access when appropriate, performing activities such as decrypting/decrypting the message if necessary, recording information about the access and about recipient instruction related to the message, archiving the message if necessary, and adding the message when it is no longer needed) (col. 3, lines 40-47).

Anderson also discloses "messenger tracker component will also monitor the messages to determine when it is no longer necessary to store a message. For example, if all recipients have reviewed the message and none have instructed that the message be saved (or in an embodiment where the default is to save the message and all recipients have indicated to delete the message), the message tracker can delete the stored message" (col. 7, lines 17-24). However, Anderson does not explicitly teach updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data. On the other hand, Smith discloses updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data

(col. 10, lines 12-15). This suggests the status indicator indicates the record has been read. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Anderson's system to update the message stage field to indicate the viewer have been read the message as taught by Smith in order to allow the automatic message deletion upon all user read the message.

Regarding on claim 2, Smith teaches each said information record further comprises a message identifier value that identifies the data of said information record and each said history record further comprises a message id field that identifies data in an information record (col. 10, lines 1-18).

Regarding on claim 3, Anderson teaches history record further comprises a consumer id field that identifies a consumer of said multiple consumers that is to access data in an information record, said data identified by said message id field, said consumer id field of said history record identifying said history record as corresponding to said consumer (col. 3, lines 35-46).

Regarding on claim 4, Smith teaches updating comprising setting said message state field in the history record with a message id field the identifies said data that said consumer is provided access to and with a consumer id field that identifies said consumer (col. 10, lines 12-18).

Regarding on claims 5 and 47, Anderson teaches in which prefix index key compression is used to store only on instance of a message identifier value that identifies the data of an information record in said history table for each history record for said information record (col. 3, lines 3-47).

Regarding on claim 6, Smith teaches storing data to be accessed by a consumer in an information record creating a history record for each consumer that is access said data, and setting said message state field in each said history record to indicate said data has not been accessed (col. 10, lines 12-17).

Regarding on claim 7, Anderson teaches a read-order table comprising order data that indicates the relative order that data in said information record is to be accessed by said multiple consumers, said method further comprising identifying the data of in information record that a consumer is to be provided access to by said order data in said read-order table (col. 3, lines 30-47).

Regarding on claim 8, Anderson teaches reading one or more history records of said history table, said one or more history records comprising a history table read; and

deleting an information record if all the message state fields in all of the history records of said history table read indicate that said data in said information record has been accessed (col. 3, lines 30-47).

Regarding on claim 9, Anderson teaches a work list table, said work list table comprising one or more work entries, each work entry comprising an identification of data in an information record (col. 6, lines 30-45).

Regarding on claim 10, Anderson teaches adding a work entry to said work list table, said work entry comprising an identification (col. 6, lines 30-45).

Regarding on claim 11, Anderson teaches accessing a work entry in said work list table (col. 6, lines 30-45);

reading one or more history records of said history table, said one or more

Art Unit: 2162

history records comprising a history table read, said one or more history records comprising said history table read determined by said work entry (col. 6, lines 30-45) and

deleting an information record if all the message state fields in all of the history records (message queue) of said history table indicate that said data in said information record has been accessed (col. 4, lines 25-44).

Regarding on claim 12, Anderson teaches batting two or more work entries in said work table list table (col. 6, lines 45-60); and

performing in a single transaction reading one or more history records of said history table, said one or more history records determined by said two or more work entries, and deleting one or more information records (col. 4, lines 25-44).

Claim 13 is rejected under the same reason as claim 1, in addition, Smith also discloses an information queue comprising one or more information queue records each said information queue record comprising information to be accessed by one or more consumers (col. 9, lines 9-11).

Regarding on claim 14, Smith teaches each said information queue record further comprises said identification of said information of said information queue record (col. 9, lines 9-11).

Regarding on claim 15, Smith teaches each said table record further comprises a message state field that indicates if the information in said information queue identified in the corresponding information identification field of

said table record has been delivered to the consumer identified in the consumer identification field of said table record (col. 10, lines 12-18).

Regarding on claim 16, Smith teaches a read-order table record further comprises state field that indicates if the information in said information queue identified in the corresponding information identification field of said table record has been delivered to the consumer identified in the consumer identification field of said table record (col. 10, lines 12-18).

Regarding on claim 17, Anderson teaches read-order table comprises one or more records, each said record of said read-order table comprising in identification field identifies information in an information queue record, each said record of said read-order table further comprising an enqueue time field comprises said order data (col. 6, lines 20-20).

Regarding on claim 18, Anderson teaches a work list table, said work list table comprising one or more work list entries, each said work list entry comprising an identification of information in an information queue record (col. 3, lines 35-40).

Regarding on claim 19, Anderson teaches work list entry is a record (col. 3, lines 35-40);

Regarding on claim 20, Anderson teaches work list table comprises one or more work records and each said work list entry is a field in a work record (col. 3, lines 35-40).

Claim 21 is rejected under the same reason as claim 13, in addition, Anderson a work list table separated from said message queue and said history



table comprising one or more work list entries, each said work list entry comprising a message identification (col. 5, lines 20-39).

Regarding on claim 22, Anderson teaches a read-order table comprising one or more read-order records, each said read-order-record comprising a message identification and order data, said order data indicating the relative order that the message of said message queue that is identified by the message identification of said read-order record is to be delivered to a consumer (col. 5, lines 20-39).

Regarding on claims 23, 31 and 38, Anderson teaches a method for multiple consumers to access information in a non first-in first out, prescribed order, said information comprising one or more piece of information, a first piece of information stored in a first location, said method comprising:

providing access to said first piece of information to a first consumer of said multiple consumers (electronic message to be distributed to one or more recipients) (col. 3, lines 35-37). Anderson does not explicitly teach indicating in a second location in a history table that said first consumer has accessed said first piece of information, said history table having first message state field for indicating whether said first consumer has accessed said first piece of information; providing access to said first piece of information to a second consumer of said multiple consumers; and indicating in a third location in said history table that said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information, said history table having a second message state field for indicating whether said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information.

However, Smith discloses indicating in a second location in a history table that said first consumer has accessed said first piece of information, said history table having first message state field for indicating whether said first consumer has accessed said first piece of information; providing access to said first piece of information to a second consumer of said multiple consumers; and indicating in a third location in said history table that said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information, said history table having a second message state field for indicating whether said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information (col. 6, lines 30-34 and col. 10, lines 12-15 and col. 10, lines 12-15). This suggests the status indicator is the location in the table to indicate the records being accessed by the second user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Anderson's system to update the message stage field to indicate the viewer have been read the message as taught by Smith in order to allow the automatic message deletion upon all user read the message.

Regarding on claims 24, 32 and 39, Smith teaches first location comprises an information entry in a queue of information (col. 5, lines 9-10).

Regarding on claims 25, 33 and 40, Smith teaches queue information comprises one or more information entries, and each said information entry comprises a piece of information to be accessed by one or more of said multiple consumers, each said information entry further comprising an identification of said piece of information of said piece of information in said information entry (col. 5, lines 9-10).

Regarding on claims 26, 34 and 41, Anderson teaches deleting said entry comprising said first piece of information that said first consumer and said second consumer is provided access to from said queue of information after said first consumer after said first consumer and said second have accessed said first piece of information (col. 7, lines 17-25).

Regarding on claims 28, 35 and 42, Anderson teaches second location comprises a history entry, said history entry comprising an identification of said first piece of information and an identification of said first consumer (col. 6, lines 30-35).

Regarding on claims 29, 36 and 43, Anderson teaches third location comprises another history entry in said history table, said other history entry comprising an identification of said first piece of information and in identification of said second consumer (col. 6, lines 30-35).

Regarding on claims 30, 37 and 44, Anderson teaches indicating in a fourth location an order in which said one or more pieces of information is to be accessed by said multiple consumers (col. 6, lines 30-35).

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

Art Unit: 2162

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is at 571-272-4041 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at 571-272-4107.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(571) –273-8300

[Official Communication]

Art Unit: 2162

/Baoquoc N To/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

October 25th, 2008